



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,325	12/18/2000	Brian Showers	027-0002	4574

22120 7590 06/21/2002

ZAGORIN O'BRIEN & GRAHAM LLP  
401 W 15TH STREET  
SUITE 870  
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER

CAPRON, AARON J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3714

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/740,325	SHOWERS ET AL.
	Examiner Aaron J. Capron	Art Unit 3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
MARK SAGER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 15, 18-19, 24 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Referring to claim 15, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the randomized index.”

Referring to claims 18 and 19, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the randomized set encoding.”

Referring to claim 24, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the corresponding individually secured outcome.”

Referring to claims 32-33, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the information.”

Referring to claim 34, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the computer-readable encoding.”

It is to the best understanding of the Examiner that claims 32-34 are to be dependent upon independent claim 31. Therefore, the Examiner shall treat the claims as such.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in—

- (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
- (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-29 and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schneier.

Schneier discloses a method for facilitating verifiable gaming transactions that includes a first commit sequence commits an outcome generator to a set of outcomes (2:2-5), and instances of the second commit sequence commits at least each player to an index contribution and thereafter reveal the index contribution (5:20-37); selecting from the outcomes based on a predefined combination operation on the index contribution; and thereafter revealing the set of outcomes for validation thereof (12:48 to 13:4).

Referring to claims 2 and 3, Schneier discloses a set of outcomes that corresponds to card values (7:46-58) where the cards can be shuffled (1:15-26).

Referring to claim 4, Schneier discloses a method that includes predefined combination operation that operates on an index contribution of the outcome generator (9:41-64)

Referring to claims 6 and 7, Schneier discloses a method wherein the first commit sequence includes encryption of the set of outcomes; supply of the encrypted set of outcomes to each of the players; and later access to set of outcomes using a key (2:2-5, 5:62-67, 9:3-22 and 9:41-64).

Referring to claim 8, Schneier discloses a method wherein the second commit sequence includes hashing the index contribution; supply hashed index to the outcome generator and to all of the players; and later supply of the index to the outcome generator and to all players (11:18-62 and 12:42-44).

Referring to claim 9, Schneier discloses a method wherein the first and second commit sequences include respective transformational securings selected from the set of cryptographic encodings, hashes and irreversible transforms (9:3-40 and 11:29-42).

Referring to claim 10, Schneier discloses a method wherein the first commit sequence is performed by a game processor (4:23-28) and the second sequence is performed by a respective player processor (8:36-39).

Referring to claims 11, 14 and 15, Schneier discloses a verifiable gaming transaction method comprising transformationally securing an encoding of a predetermined set of outcomes (9:8-10) supplying one or more player with the transformationally secured encoding (2:2-4 and 5:55-61); receiving a transformationally secured player index from each of the players (5:20-37 and 8:36-39); and selecting a particular one of the outcomes for revealing to the players based on the combination of the player indexes (12:42-44).

Referring to claim 12, Schneier discloses a method wherein the predetermined set of outcomes is transformationally secured using a cryptographic key (9:8-13); and wherein the player indexes are secured using a hash (11:18-62).

Referring to claim 13, Schneier discloses a method that includes receiving and verifying the player indexes against respective player indexes prior to the outcome selecting (12:48-13:4)

Referring to claim 17, Schneier discloses a method that includes a modulo function, since Schneier incorporates a counter for determining a number of players (13:5-20).

Referring to claims 18 and 19, Schneier discloses a method that includes the securing of the randomized set encoding includes cryptographically securing the set of outcomes (9:3-17,41-64).

Referring to claims 20 and 22, Schneier discloses a method comprising receiving a secured encoding of a predetermined set of outcomes for a gaming transaction; supplying a secured encoding of the player input; after each of the participants in the transaction has supplied a secured input, supplying the player input; accessing an outcome based on the combination of player input with the corresponding input for each of the participants, where the encoding is subject to later verification (12:36-13:24).

Referring to claim 21, Schneier discloses a method that includes supplying player inputs after prior supply and receipt of corresponding secured inputs (Figure 7); and accessing successive one of the outcomes selected based on combination of the successively supplied player inputs with the corresponding inputs for each of the participants 12:36-13:24).

Referring to claim 23, Schneier discloses a method that includes outcomes of the transformationally secured set thereof are individually secured (12:36-47); and wherein the accessing includes obtaining a key for a corresponding individually secured outcome.

Referring to claim 24, Schneier discloses a method that includes outcomes of the secured set thereof are individually secured; and wherein the accessing includes receiving an encoding of the particular outcome for verification against the corresponding individually secured outcome (12:62-13:4).

Referring to claim 25, Schneier discloses an outcome generator that includes a commitment sequence executable to supply one or more players with a secured set of outcomes and a reveal sequence responsive to receipt of index contributions from each of the players, the reveal sequence executable to select a particular one of the outcomes based on a combination of player indexes.

Referring to claim 26, Schneier discloses a generator that includes game logic.

Referring to claim 27, Schneier discloses a generator wherein the commitment and reveal sequences employ cryptographic transformations.

Claim 28 corresponds in scope to a player client set forth for use of the methods listed in claims 1-19 and are encompassed by use as set forth in the rejection above.

Claim 29 corresponds in scope to a computer program product set forth for use of the methods listed in claims 1-19 and are encompassed by use as set forth in the rejection above.

Claims 31-33 correspond in scope to a method of a computer-readable encoding set forth for use of the methods listed in claims 1-19 and are encompassed by use as set forth in the rejection above.

Referring to claim 34, Schneier discloses a computer-readable encoding that includes at least one message suitable for communication between the server and the client thereof (Figure 1).

Claim 35 corresponds in scope to an apparatus set forth for use of the methods listed in claims 1-19 and are encompassed by use as set forth in the rejection above.

Claims 5 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Schneier. Schneier discloses at least one of the features listed in each of the claims below, but does not teach all of the features listed in each of the claims below. However, these “untaught” features are equivalent to the features that are disclosed by Schneier.

Referring to claim 5, Schneier discloses a method that includes a set of outcomes corresponding to a set of values at least partially defined by a deck of cards (7:46-58).

Referring to claim 30, Schneier discloses a program wherein the computer readable media are selected from the set of a disk, tape other magnetic, optical, electrical storage medium (Figure 2 and 3) and a network (7:42-45).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier.

Referring to claim 16, Schneier discloses a method that includes player selected indexes that are combined, but does disclose using a bit-wise OR of binary encodings. However, it is old and well known in the art that binary logic gates (AND, OR, NOR, etc.) are used for data manipulation, especially when using a combination of data sequences. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

incorporate the OR sequence into the combination of indexes because it would be easy to calculate the data sequence using a binary logic gate.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron J. Capron whose telephone number is (703) 305-3520. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Martin-Wallace can be reached on (703) 308-4119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-9302 for regular communications and (703) 746-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

ajc  
June 14, 2002



MARK SAGER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER